

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. IX.

AUGUST, 1929.

No. 8.

Good Works.

Translated from Dr. E. Preuss's *Die Rechtfertigung*, Part IX.

THE REV. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

(Concluded.)

This is the simple sense of Jas. 2, 14—16. So also the Fathers have always understood it. All other interpretations either clearly violate God's Word, or they are refuted by the clear words of the texts. For example, some say that James contradicts Paul.¹⁾ If that were true, God's curse would rest upon him, for Gal. 1, 8. 9 we read: "But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." The fact is, however, that James did not preach another gospel than Paul. For he taught regeneration by the Word (1, 18) and that we apprehend salvation, *i. e.*, justification, by receiving, *i. e.*, believing, the Word (1, 21).²⁾ It would indeed be well to remember what St. Augustine said in reply to those who declared that the Old and the New Testament contradicted each other. He says, if that were admitted, some might be so insane as to assert that also the New Testament contradicted itself. For just as the former critics place Moses in opposition to John, so the latter might easily make the simple believe that John and Paul are in conflict with each other. However, just as the pure and genuine Christian faith confesses that Paul and John are in harmony, so it also confesses that John and Moses agree with each other.³⁾

1) De Wette, *Kommentar zu Jakobus*, 239.

2) Here James teaches, first, that the Word of God saves; secondly, that this saving Word must be accepted, *i. e.*, believed; thirdly, that it is not sufficient to have received it once [in Holy Baptism] as a noble graft. One must believe it continually.

3) Nam si esset alius, cujus item dementissimus furor ipsum Novum Testamentum sibi contrarium apud imperitos conaretur ostendere, quid aliud ageret, nisi quemadmodum isti Moysen et Johannem, ita illi Paulum et Johannem tanquam inimicos rixantesque proponeret? Sicut autem sincerissima et verissima fides commendat Pauli Johannisque concordiam, sic Moysi et Johannis pacem intuens . . . amplectitur. (Augustinus, *Sermones*, Classis I, Serm. I, § 5.)

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Good if True.—In discussing Biblical criticism, the *Presbyterian* has some very kind words to say about the Lutheran Church in America. It writes: "If we frankly face the comparison of two sections of the great Lutheran Church, such as the Lutheran Church in Germany and the Lutheran Church in America, we have an illustration that is most striking. Were one to talk with an Evangelical Lutheran from Germany, he would say that the Church there is just beginning to rally from the severe blow that the destructive critics gave it in their pretensions to scholarly analysis made of the Scriptures a generation ago. The Church there is seeking to regain its hold on the large classes of thoughtful minds, whose faith in Luther's Bible was entirely shattered by these presumptuous iconoclasts. The Lutheran Church in America has been less affected by Modernism in its train of higher criticism than have any of the larger denominations. It has been fortunate in having a group of scholars who saw the fallacy of much of the claims of criticism and so led their people past the precipice. In all the history there have not been so warm an evangelical spirit as to-day and so wide a missionary zeal and so many worthy applicants for the Gospel ministry as there are in the United Lutheran Church just now. The churches in the two countries present an abiding warning and contrast." As is indicated, the writer speaks of the U. L. C. in particular. We are glad to see it praised, but aside from its unionistic tendencies there have been some alarming and disconcerting signs of late, showing that the spirit of indifference and Modernism is gaining ground in prominent places. May God strengthen all those in the U. L. C. who remain faithful to the old foundation and make them victorious!

A.

Lutheran Church Observes Four-Hundredth Anniversary.—The *Presbyterian* (February 28) writes: "Lutheran groups all over the world will commemorate this year the four-hundredth anniversary of the two Catechisms published by Martin Luther in 1529. Jubilee editions of the so-called 'Small' Catechism, which has been translated into more than one hundred languages and used as the 'Layman's Bible' for four centuries, will be issued, one house planning on an

edition of a million copies. Mass meetings in large centers and special services in congregations are planned. The Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States is sponsoring an essay contest, in which the children of its parish- and Sabbath-schools are to participate. That same body at its triennial convention next June, when delegates representing more than a million Lutherans will assemble in Chicago, is giving a prominent place on its program to the celebration of the Catechism quadricentennial.

"The book so uniquely vital has a fascinating history. Martin Luther wrote the Large Catechism as a treatise in which he expounded the fundamental truths of Christianity, which he also set forth in questions and answers in the Small Catechism. Both of these appeared early in 1529. They were born of the need of the times. Religious ignorance was wide-spread. A survey of conditions in the churches of Saxony made a decade after the Reformation had gotten under way revealed a deplorable lack of Christian knowledge, even among clergymen. The preface to the Small Catechism contains a graphic picture of the situation that prompted Luther to write these books.

"When a representative of the press approached Mrs. Lindbergh with an inquiry as to how her son had developed a nature in which moral convictions are so dominant, she very frankly admitted that the glory was not her work. That honor, she said, belongs to his father, who, when their son could not get to a place of worship, continued to drill him in Luther's Catechism till all its great teachings were thoroughly ingrained into his very life. Catechism classes are still the most effective means of instructing the mind as well as leading the heart to repentance and faith."

MUELLER.

The Lutheran Church and Spiritual Training.—The *Lutheran* of June 6, in an editorial, gives expression to some sentiments on the above subject which deserve a wider reading. Dr. N. C. Melhorn, editor of the *Lutheran*, writes: "The Lutheran Church once taught both religion and arithmetic. Christian parents supported a ministry of teaching as well as one of mercy and preaching. The state took over a portion of this school-work, and the Church neglected what remained. More and more the spiritual abilities in the youth and in society have been left to grow wild or to struggle in competition with secularism. Now we have the astonishing spectacle of commonwealths resorting to laws to prevent state institutions from maltreating the Bible. . . . The folk that must correct this situation are the parents. To the degree that the Lutheran people are suffering, Lutheran parents are obligated. The membership of the Lutheran churches has been too largely indifferent for fifty years to the drift toward danger among their children. The evidence of that indifference is the present status of our church-schools, our colleges, and seminaries. . . . We have concluded also that the majority of the constituents of the Lutheran churches have lost due interest in the spiritual training of their youth. Only thus can their attitude toward education that is Christianly cultural be interpreted. They talk about what the schools want; they should discuss what their children

need. They should feel shame that indifference to the proper culture of their offspring has resulted in the present undervaluation of spiritual capacities in education." We hold that the above words abundantly justify the emphasis which we Missourians are laying on the maintenance of Christian day-schools. If the question is asked, What has brought on the deplorable conditions spoken of by Dr. Melhorn? two words may be said to contain the answer: materialism and doctrinal indifference. We hope that the earnest plea of the *Lutheran* will bear good fruits. A.

May a Pastor Attempt to Obtain a Better Charge?—On this ever live question a writer in the *Lutheran Church Herald* presents some good points. He says: "A pastor who has under these circumstances accepted a call and who professes and acknowledges it as a divine call cannot, if he is sincere and earnest, with a good conscience look about for another charge. It cannot be defended before God to push one-self forward and lay plans to obtain some other charge which he may think he desires for the time being. Such action would be indefensible and highly offensive on the part of a Christian pastor. If for temporal, materialistic, selfish reasons he leaves one charge and through mere human and personal influence obtains a call to another charge, he robs himself of the blessed joy and comfort that his call is divine and in accordance with God's will." The writer, continuing, quotes from Dr. Walther's *Pastorale* and in the quotation draws attention to five points: 1) that a pastor must never seek a removal, especially not for materialistic reasons; 2) that he must not withdraw from his charge because of opposition and persecution on the part of wicked people; 3) that it must be clear to human judgment that the call offered him is of greater importance than his present charge; 4) that the one called should not alone decide whether he ought to accept or reject the call; 5) that he should not leave his charge without its express permission. A.

Luther's Stand at Marburg is usually condemned as altogether unjustifiable. When, therefore, a theologian outside of our circles points out what grave matters were at issue there, it is well to make a note of it. Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson, in his book *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit* (1928), declares on page 184: "At first sight it may seem to the Protestant a tragedy of history that at the famous conference between Luther and Zwingli in the Castle of Marburg (1529) their agreement on fourteen out of the fifteen articles of the Christian faith should have been nullified by their inability to agree on the fifteenth—the relation of the elements to the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Yet, disastrous as was the resultant division of Lutheran and Reformed Protestantism, it did represent genuine and cardinal differences of conviction, which had to work themselves out in the subsequent history of the two churches." The concluding paragraph of the chapter reads: "On this and kindred matters of practise and theory the Christian Church may long continue to be divided, and no man can foresee the issue. . . . But enough has been said to show two things. The first is that the sacramental issue is not one of those minor and negligible questions which im-

patient outsiders regard it as being; for it raises great principles and shows wide horizons affecting the whole nature of the Church and the Gospel of Christ. As a contemporary theologian of Germany (Professor Hirsch) has said, "The vital point in our knowledge of the Gospel lies in our answer to the question, How is the Holy Spirit given?" It was, indeed, impossible for the Lutherans to establish fraternal relations with the Reformed. Their disagreement on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper sprang from their disagreement on fundamentals. This disagreement did not "affect the whole nature of the Church" in the sense which Dr. Robinson attaches to these words, who believes in the sacramental nature of the Church, but it does affect the vital doctrine of the means of grace ("how is the Holy Spirit given?") and the vital question as to the authority of reason in the interpretation of Scripture. "The second thing to be always remembered by the Church and its theologians is that the Sacraments — or any theory of them — are subsidiary to the reality of the gift of the Holy Spirit and that the true and ultimate *eirenicon* of a divided Church will not be found without a deeper experience of His presence and a fuller and a wider recognition of His activity." This remark is in line with the fundamental error of the modern experience-theology, the conviction, as Dr. Robinson puts it in the preface of his book, "that religious experience is to be taken as the starting-point of theological reconstruction." The one efficient *eirenicon* is the principle of faithful adherence to the words of Scripture. It is only through the Word that the Holy Spirit acts. Any "experience of His presence" which does not flow from the Word has only a disintegrating influence. It began at Marburg and has continued to this day. We cannot unite on the platform built by the theology of experience. It is too precarious. What, for instance, does it offer in place of the Scripture doctrine on the Lord's Supper? "In the same way we may explain the sacramental realism of St. Paul's account of the Lord's Supper. Again, we see that it commemorates the most salient fact of the Gospel — the Christ crucified, who gave His body for His disciples and initiated the new covenant in His blood. It consisted of a series of acts which suggestively represented the breaking of this body and the shedding of this blood. It implied a spiritual experience of redemption through Christ which was renewed by these very acts. Paul says that they 'proclaim' or 'preach' the Lord's death, *i. e.*, the Lord's Supper is a dramatic confession of faith. But in doing this, they do more for believers. The sacramental realism of the apostle is shown by his warning against communion with demons through heathen sacrifices. These acts 'realize,' as did baptism the experience of being 'in Christ,' the mystical union with Him, which is the core of the Pauline experience." Whatever more this passage means, it means, at least, to deny the Real Presence and to teach the old Reformed "commemoration" and "suggestive representation." But it does not, after all, mean even that. For the writer continues: "On the assumption that this is true historical exegesis, it may be asked whether it contributes anything useful to a modern conception of the Sacraments. Can we think of them, on

grounds of modern experience and modern thought, in quite the same way as did the earliest believers? Probably not; for no generation thinks quite in the same way as that before it, and the difference is apt to be increased the further back we go. — Perhaps that ground (that more fundamental ground of agreement) may ultimately be discovered in a fuller and more adequate philosophical statement of the reality of history, the genuine contribution to the whole of reality made by human acts." So then the common platform which is supposed to unite the churches is not yet nearly finished. And we certainly are not willing to wait till they have constructed it. This platform is as precarious as that which Luther was invited to get ready to stand on, concerning which he declared: "As to their declaration that they are going to wait till the Christian Church has given its decision, let the devil wait for that; I cannot wait so long, for the Christian Church has already decided on all points." The Christian Church has taken its stand on the Holy Scriptures and accepted every decision of Scripture. Our platform has been completed long ago and is the only effective *eirenicon*. — As to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Lutherans and Reformed are as far apart as ever. Luther would not bear with the *Schwaermerei* of Zwingli, and Lutherans will not bear with the *Schwaermerei* of the experience-men.

E.

The Theological Seminaries and the Pew. — Under this heading Helen Barrett Montgomery writes in the *Watchman-Examiner*, among other things: "Our stake in the theological seminaries is a very real one — we who sit in the pews. In a way they are our most precious denominational possession. In them is vested the woe or weal of our churches. If they deeply succeed, our children will be fed. If they fail, our children will spiritually starve. In them now are being trained the future leaders of our churches.

"The pew wants to see men of God put in charge of all our seminaries. It seems to us more important that the president should be a prophet than that he should be a scholar. We want men who walk with God and talk with God and can interpret Him to the young men who form the student-body. There ought to be at the head of all our seminaries men who can make the student see visions and dream dreams, . . . who can catch the love of God and the faith of Jesus by a divine contagion and so pass it on.

"We of the pews are hungry for the Bible so explained and illuminated that we can live by it and through it. But the hungry sheep are not fed, at least not by most holders of theological degrees. How many seminaries are turning out graduates who are men of the Book? men who live by it and make it live to others? How much time is given in the ordinary curriculum to the plain study of the English Bible? I do not mean study of origins, of grammar, or criticism of it, but the plain text of the English Bible which it will be their life-work to expound.

"Perhaps I am mistaken, but my observation is that people enjoy expository preaching. They certainly throng to hear those so gifted to open the Book to them. . . . Too many of our theological seminary

graduates are poorly equipped to open any Scripture. They are not deeply acquainted with the Scripture. They have not formed the habit of digging deep to mine out the most precious truths.

"Another dream that I have for the theological seminaries is that they should be deeply missionary. How can a man be fitted to preach the Gospel, the good news, who has not grasped the Bible emphasis on the missionary motive and passion? Is it not disgrace enough to have certain churches that come perilously near to being antimission without having pastors in the same category? . . . We are told that the pastor is the true leader of the church. Judged by our contributions to home and foreign missions, how many of our young theologists go out from the seminaries imbued with a missionary conception of the Bible and the faith, prepared to lead their churches into a missionary enthusiasm? Is it not possible for our seminaries to major on this a bit more than they do? We have something of infinite value to the world. We are in trust of the Gospel. It is not ours, it belongs to the world. I should like to see the theological seminaries a bit more stirred up over the fact of our trusteeship."

In this way the article continues, showing how the average Christian interprets the mission of the theological seminary and what he expects of them. It is an earnest plea for those fundamental things which, though recognized by all true Christians, are being neglected more and more in theological seminaries. Of all the iniquitous causes that have served to crowd them out, Modernism is perhaps the most conspicuous. Where this foul pollution is permitted to reign, students will learn neither to understand Holy Scripture nor to expound it properly to others. It is high time for the churches of our country to realize the truth that theological seminaries exist solely for the purpose of training men to preach the Gospel.

MUELLER.

The Place of the Layman.—There is a movement on in the Methodist Church to restore the rights and privileges of the laity in the Church. A communication published in the *Western Christian Advocate*, April 25, 1929, states: "For some time now the call has sounded that laymen should be admitted in some degree to sessions of the Annual Conference. . . . With a remarkable degree of unanimity the consensus of opinion at this time seems to be that it is highly desirable to admit to some extent laymen into the Annual Conference session. Many years ago when the question of the admission of laymen into the General Conference was being discussed, there was much doubt expressed as to the wisdom of making a change whereby they might be admitted. Finally, after much debate, the change was made, and in spite of the dire prophecies of disaster made by some at that time, no great catastrophe has followed upon their admission. In order to prevent either order from 'dominating' the affairs of the General Conference, its rules wisely provide that upon proper demand a vote may be taken by 'orders.' Since the admission of laymen the two groups have worked with such harmony at sessions of the General Conference that it is very rare that a demand for a vote by 'orders' is made, and only once or twice, possibly, has it been

that it has been actually necessary to take such a vote. No one would for one minute urge that the General Conference return to its old system, that the membership thereof consist merely of the clergy. The last General Conference recognized the spirit of the age and very wisely passed the necessary legislation, so that, upon approval by the various Annual and Lay Conferences, the 'Central Conferences' may elect their own bishops. If this legislation is wise (and few will assert that it is not), how much wiser will it be to admit, to some degree at least, laymen into the Annual Conference, not for the purpose of supplanting the pastors, but to permit the laymen to secure better insight into those problems which so seriously affect the welfare of our beloved Church. One naturally inquires as to the benefits which will accrue should the change be made. They may briefly be summarized as follows. In the first place, the joint sessions will furnish opportunity for greater cooperation on the part of the laity. They will be able to see for themselves and at first hand those questions which challenge the attention of the clergy at their Annual Conference sessions. Then, secondly, there will be no more divided responsibility; no longer can either the pastor or the layman throw the blame for the failure of any program or plan upon the shoulders of the other. We must also, thirdly, remember that better first-hand information can be given. How often has a pastor wished that his laymen could have heard some brilliant lecture or some inspirational sermon which profoundly affected him while attending an Annual Conference session! Fourthly, we must consider the great saving of time that will be effected. If a bishop desires to get some message over in his area at conference, both the clergy and laity can be reached at one time." We need not wait for "the spirit of the age" to define the status of the layman in the Church. Scripture has long ago defined it. And in the light of the Scripture statements: "All things are yours," "Ye are a royal priesthood," the proposal that laymen should be admitted "in some degree" and "to some extent" into the Annual Conference sessions is inadmissible, and the provision that "a vote may be taken by 'orders'" should not stand. To give the laymen the right to speak and vote at synodical meetings is not a development of the last centuries, but a return to the original practise. Matthias was made an apostle at a "conference" attended by about a hundred and twenty disciples. The "conference" of Acts 15 admitted to its deliberations many who were not apostles and elders, and the resolution passed was signed by "the apostles and elders and brethren." It is a very wise provision that entitles the laymen to take the floor at synods. The history of the Council of Nicaea relates this striking incident: "When all the bishops failed to confute a sophist and to resolve his subtleties, a layman at last took the floor (a man of most simple parts, not at all trained in speaking), through whom God would show that His kingdom does not stand in words or in the exalted position of the bishops, but in power. For this layman thus confounded the sophist with God's Word that he durst not utter another peep; yea, he voluntarily confessed that he was beaten and turned to the Christian religion."

Doctrinal discussion must not be restricted to the clergy. The Lord has laid the duty of judging the doctrine preached in a Church upon the laymen no less than upon the clergy. We could wish that the *Western Christian Advocate* contributor had quoted the following words of Luther (Luther uses strong language, but the case calls for it): "It is the right and duty of all Christians and of every one of them to determine and judge doctrinal matters, so much so that he is accursed who infringes upon this right by a hair's breadth. For Christ has fixed this right in many unassailable passages, for instance, Matt. 7, 15: 'Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing.' He certainly addresses these words to the people against the teachers and commands the people to avoid their false teachers. But how can they avoid them without knowing them? And how know them, if they have not the right to judge? Now, He not only permits, but also commands them to judge, so that this single passage suffices against the decrees of all Popes, all fathers, all councils, all schools that have assigned the right to judge and determine to the bishops and clergy exclusively and impiously and sacrilegiously despoiled the Church, the queen, of it. For here stands Christ and says: 'Beware of false prophets.'" (19, 341.) E.

"**Placements in the Ministry.**" — Commenting on the report of a commission dealing with the "Problem of Placement" the *Living Church*, June 1, 1929, says: "To-day a priest has no way of securing an opportunity to do the work for which he was ordained, neither has an ordinary parish the means of securing a rector who will fit into its conditions; while also there is no way to remedy the condition of a misfit in the rectorship which prevents the progress of a parish and at the same time prevents its rector from voluntarily relieving the situation even if he perceives it. We are an episcopal Church with a congregational system of placing the clergy. Roman Catholics and Methodists are much more truly episcopal in administration than are we, and both of them vest in their bishops a good deal more power than do we. However orthodox we may be in maintaining the necessity of the historic episcopate in a united Church, in practise the one thing in regard to our bishops that we treat as beyond any question is that they will err. As that admirable standard of thought, dear to the heart of every Broad Churchman, the Thirty-nine Articles, so charitably asserts of various historic churches other than our own, like those churches, even our own bishops 'have erred' and may conceivably be expected to err again. Alas, experience shows that the expectation is sometimes justified. So our whole administrative system is based on the hope of keeping the erring order from doing any more harm that can be prevented. Because bishops err, — and they do, — we seem really and officially only to trust the laity. Now, without going so far as to place any real confidence or power in the episcopate, the commission proposes to try out a committee system as a limitation on the almost absolute power of the vestry to call a rector, where, after he is called, not all the king's horses and all the king's men can get rid of him if he is a failure. Theoretically and canonically a call is for life and cannot be termi-

nated by either party without the consent of the other. Practically, our reverend fathers of the clergy have discovered how they can break the pact by the simple process of resigning and leaving, while the vestry, consisting only of poor, ignorant, priest-ridden laymen like ourselves, have no such easy solution to the problem of dissolving a rectorship. The laity, in the expressive language of the day, 'hold the bag,' whether the second party elects to move on or to stay. The bishop placidly wonders what will happen next; that is about all that he is permitted to do. Yes, the present system doesn't work. It is just possible that, while the bishop pursues his time-honored function of erring, the laity occasionally do the same thing. We have even heard that the 'inferior clergy' do. But must our system be perpetually based upon a presumption of errors? The commission now proposes that . . . there is to be a board in every diocese consisting of the bishop and the standing committee which, in case of a vacancy in the rectorship of any parish, shall 'nominate at least three clergymen to the parish for election as rector. If none of the persons so nominated by the Placement Committee be satisfactory to the parish, the Placement Committee shall then nominate three more and continue so to nominate until a selection has been made.' . . ."

—Passing over the frivolous, supercilious, and bitter tone pervading the article, we should like to bring it to the attention of those of us who are becoming restive under the system by which these matters are dealt with among us. Our system is based on the principle of the right of the Christian congregation to call its minister and of the conscientious application of the rule set down 1 Cor. 12, 7: "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." In accordance with these principles the *Synodical Handbook* provides: "Whenever Lutheran congregations having no pastors make application to the Synod for a pastor, the Synod shall, through its officials, propose candidates and thus earnestly seek to supply congregations with faithful shepherds as soon as possible. . . . When calling a pastor, a congregation ought always to seek the advice of other pastors of the Synod who are in charge of a congregation, it being understood, however, that this is not compulsory, yet in accordance with good and wholesome usage. . . . Since the calling of servants of the Word is a most important matter, for which the advice of experienced men, who are also well acquainted with synodical conditions, is needed, and since the duty of the presidents of the various Districts is to advise congregations upon their request, congregations, pastors, teachers, and students must not unofficially interfere in the matter of calls and elections." (P. 132 f.) Will you engage to devise a better system? You cannot adopt the Roman Catholic and Methodist system. Principle No. 1 forbids that. You will not want to adopt the old Protestant Episcopal system. Principle No. 2 forbids that, and they are discarding it. And their new plan, which, in general, is in accord with Principle No. 2, provides, in opposition to Principle No. 1, that the power of "removal or transfer" of a parochial clergyman is to be vested in the new committee. What fault have you to find with our system? You say that once in a while mistakes are made. That

certainly will be the case as long as our congregations and their advisers are not infallible. But under our system and the providence of God these things right themselves. The real trouble lies, not with the system, but with the non-application of the system. "More than one congregation which simply ignored the officials of Synod and relied entirely on its own wisdom subsequently bitterly rued its rejection of good counsel and advice. Every pastor and teacher simply does not fit in every place." (*Lutheraner*, April 15, 1924.) "We believe that it is not God's will that a pastor should *seek* a call or *offer* himself for such a call, but he should wait until the Master calls him. We believe that this matter of call needs to be considered carefully and *prayerfully* by both pastors and congregations and that nothing should be done by either pastors or congregations that may tend to lower the estimate of the call in the sight of the Christian people." (Pastors of Mankato Circuit, Norw. Luth. Church.) Synod, in our system, is "but an advisory body," surely. (Article VII.) But the supremacy of the congregation together with the supremacy of the conscience, governed by the law of charity, of the person called by the congregation, and the duty of congregation, adviser, and pastor to apply 1 Cor. 12, 7 conscientiously, wisely, prayerfully, are not matters left to our discretion. Instead of planning new systems, let the good old system be applied. "The officials are supposed to be acquainted with the qualities and qualifications of the pastors and the status of the various congregations. They will act conscientiously in these matters. Verily, if all parties concerned would be more conscientious in proposing candidates and nominating candidates, there would not be so many changes in pastorates, mission-fields would not be vacated prematurely, and faithful pastors would receive appointments adequate to their gifts. Let all concerned use God-pleasing circumspection!" (Syn. Rep., Central Dist., 1924, p. 39.) E.

"The Rational Basis of the Trinitarian Doctrine." — The *Presbyterian* publishes, under this heading, the following from a correspondent: —

"Christian doctrines in common belief are based upon revelation and are contrary to, or at least far apart from, human reason. One of the most distinctive Christian doctrines is the doctrine of the Trinity. That is supposed to be imposed upon man's thinking. Bible thinking aids human reasoning and stimulates practical every-day common sense.

"The first chapter of Genesis reveals a conference and a council in the Godhead concerning the works of creation. This is as we would expect. When God created man, He said: 'It is not good that man should be alone.' Neither was it good that God should be alone. Man was made in the image of God. A God who is only one person must necessarily be infinitely lonesome. He could have no one who could thoroughly understand Him and appreciate Him. One person must understand and appreciate another better who is brought up in the same environment, who has the same training, who is socially and probably racially like the other. No created being could understand or appreciate God or give Him satisfactory society.

"There is an old saying, 'Two is a company, three is a crowd.' Probably it would be a little more accurate grammatically to say, 'Two are a company, three are a crowd.' Three give all possible relationships. Two can have relationships toward each other. They can also have relationships with reference to a third. Two would not give society in the Godhead. Three do give society in the Godhead. Each one could thoroughly know and understand and appreciate the others, for each one has a background of eternal goodness and righteousness."

The column from which this is taken carries the notation: "The views expressed in this column are not necessarily those of the *Presbyterian*." Nevertheless, why would a periodical of the caliber of the *Presbyterian* publish such cogitations? Are they displayed as a warning example? As such they are here offered. E.

The Lies of Modernism.—The *Lutheran Church Herald* has published some valuable articles from the pen of Dr. M. J. Stolce on "The Danger of Modernism to Our Church." A few of the opening paragraphs, speaking of the modern origin of the plague, are especially informing.

"The name Modernism is of comparatively recent date. It came into being when Loisy and Tyrrell demanded more freedom for theological thinking in the Catholic Church. They and their ideas were, of course, promptly condemned, but the name has persisted and in course of time came to be applied to a certain movement inside the Protestant Church.

"When leading Modernists of to-day speak of their principles as something entirely *new* that *they* have had the profundity of mind and courage to discover and proclaim, we may say that it is nothing of the kind. It is the ghost of the old Rationalism come back to us in a new drapery. To those who know what the Rationalism of the eighteenth century put forward in the name of theological science the present-day Modernism must seem to be a rather *tiresome repetition*. But we may, just for the sake of argument, look the old ghost in the face once more, or perhaps better, let it speak for itself, through its leading champions.

"I think it is generally acknowledged by impartial students of doctrine that the return of the old Rationalism is primarily due to Albert Ritschl in Germany. He rejected the deity of Christ, but maintained that Jesus was a religious genius, a religious hero, who progressed so far in moral and spiritual attainments that He has to the Christian 'the value of God.' He denied Christ's miraculous birth and resurrection. The atonement of Christ affected man alone and did not change God's attitude to sinful man. The one and only purpose of His life and death was to show that God is love.

"A most objectionable feature of Ritschlianism is its two-facedness. It uses the old terms and names with new meanings; the negative modern thought is clothed in the old orthodox expressions.

"Modernism of to-day is merely a further development of Ritschl. But the leaders of Modernism do not recognize any chief, not even their father Ritschl. There is one thing about which they all agree,

and that is their sneering attitude to orthodoxy of any kind. 'Orthodox religion was all very well for our grandfathers and our grandmothers, but it cannot satisfy the modern mind, with all its advanced scientific and philosophic knowledge' (statement recently made by a state university professor).

"The saving power of the Church does not rest on its doctrines," says Rauschenbusch. 'My own conviction is that, if all the creeds and dogmas and paraphernalia of the churches in Christendom to-day could be set aside, nothing would be lost' (*Biblical World*, April, 1916, p. 268)."

A.

Pseudomissionaries in India.—The ravages of Modernism are apparent not only in the churches at home, but also in those of the foreign mission fields. The *Sunday-school Times* writes of the pernicious syncretism practised in India by Modernistic missionaries as follows: "The pseudomissionaries in India seem to be proceeding apace with their merger of Christianity and Hinduism. In Poona, according to the *National Missionary Intelligencer*, August, 1928, the Christ Sevha Sangh unites daily, 'amidst the rapture of bells and incense, . . . to worship the lotus feet of God and to pour out their own souls in loving adoration. They study the Hindu Dharmasastras and Yogasutras.' This provides 'opportunities for adherents of all religions to go apart for retreat in an atmosphere favorable to spiritual realizations, or *samadhi*.' But above all they combine the *bhakti*, *gnana*, and *karma marga* (the three ways of salvation according to Hinduism, by worship, wisdom, and works) into one Krista Seva Marga (way of Christian service).

"This information comes from a recent number of the *Indian Christian*. It also tells us how some years ago the Bombay Christian Council, in a new edition of their Marathi hymn-book, included a hymn by the Hindu poet Tukaram in praise of his god Vithoba. This is No. 411 in *Sacred Hymns*. The same publication also calls to the attention of the Christian public a contribution made by a young missionary newly come to India to the *National Christian Council Review*. After describing an address on the Bhagavad Gita, he continues: 'Hinduism is a great faith and one worth keeping. The appeal came to us [from this Hindu lecturer] as brothers and not as teachers, and none of us who were present failed to respect that appeal. On Sunday evening we went to a service at the Ramakrishna High School. The Sanskrit and Tamil chants, together with the ritual of the boy priests in the railed-off portion of the beautiful little *mandapan*, were impressive in themselves before we knew what they stood for, and the moment when the sacred fire was brought round to the accompaniment of an insistent bell and unseen drums was tense and luminous. We felt we had real worship and departed with the gladly accepted gift in our mouths of "meat offered to idols."'"

Such syncretism is disgusting and highly offensive even to the Hindus themselves. Must they not regard the Christian religion as utterly worthless when they see these would-be missionaries worshipping in their very shrines and before their idols? At the same time

this abominable syncretism exhibits the damnable degradation of Modernism. Modernism, too, is pantheistic; for it worships the "immanent divine power," which is one with nature, and its way to salvation is like that of Hinduism, the way of works or character.

MUELLER.

Iron-Clad Contracts to be Signed Up. — The *Lutheran Church Herald* reports that an attempt is being made by the Federal Council to force "local federations to sign up iron-clad contracts obliging them to use the Federal Council religious program and none other." The article continues: "If this plan succeeds, Dr. Macfarland states, 'in the future no denomination or individual church will be able to secure any time whatever on the air unless they are willing to pay prohibitively high prices for brief periods of broadcast. The Columbia Broadcasting System has not yet developed any policy in regard to religious broadcasts save that of attempted interference with the National Broadcasting Company and the Federal Council program. For instance, out of pure malice the Columbia Broadcasting System is broadcasting the sermons of Dr. Barnhouse, a Presbyterian Fundamentalist, of Philadelphia, at precisely the same hour that the Federal Council broadcasts Dr. Fosdick's sermons. The Council expects, however, as soon as its present arrangements are completed, to negotiate with the Columbia Broadcasting System with a view to taking over all of its religious broadcasts.'"

As Dr. Macfarland further explained, it is the intention of the Council to permit on the air no pastors who have not been sanctioned by the Federal Council. On this intolerance and persecution of all who do not agree with the liberalistic Federal Council, the *Lutheran Church Herald* comments: "We look upon this movement as a brazen attempt to monopolize the remote-control broadcasting and to force upon the nation the Cadman-Poling-Fosdick brand of counterfeit religion in the name of Protestantism. They represent a fraction of the Reformed churches, but certainly not the 2,714,685 Lutheran communicants. Any effort to muzzle free speech by iron-clad contracts to shut out others, is both un-American and unchristian. The Christian people of the nation will protest against this religious broadcasting trust."

MUELLER.

The Intolerance of the Unionists. — Not all the members in the various denominations that are speeding toward huge mergers are in favor of the proposed unions. Minorities in every denomination visualize the pernicious effects upon the traditional doctrines of the various church groups, should the mergers be effected. But their voices are not listened to. Of this the *Presbyterian* (May 16, 1929) complains in reproachful terms. We read: "At the meeting at Lancaster last year, except for the discussion, the negative side of organic church union was not presented. If an expression from a prominent member of the Council overheard by one seated near him was an indication of the sentiment of any number, it clearly indicated a spirit of intolerance toward those who oppose corporate church union. This gentleman was heard to say as a representative of the Presbyterian Church in Canada arose: 'Oh, have we got to

listen to this here?" The disposition is manifest on the part of not a few that only the voices in favor of union shall be heard. In other words, their purpose appears to be to suppress everything that would seem to call into question the virtue of this much-belauded movement. . . .

"Why, then, this disposition on the part of many to suppress discussion, to conceal facts, to be mastered by an obsession which in large measure is of the highest theoretical character, and to press blindly on, unwilling to be taught, whether by history or experience? The advocates of union should surely see the folly of such a policy. Why suppress or conceal in a course which is so loudly proclaimed to be in fullest harmony with the divine will and its advocates to be so completely under the control of the divine Spirit and in the enjoyment of a vision which seems not to have been granted to ordinary folk?"

The answers to these questions are clear to all who have studied the history of mergers. In the history of our American church mergers, instances of bigotry, intolerance, and downright denial and suppression of the Word of God are not entirely lacking.

MUELLER.

A Reserve for Aborigines.—The *Australian Lutheran* writes editorially: "It is the suggestion of a conference called by the Minister for Home Affairs that a large area, taking in part of the Northern Territory, part of West Australia, and part of South Australia and comprising some 65,000 square miles, shall be set aside as a sanctuary for the aborigines still wandering about in the wild bush of Northern Australia. Here they are to be permitted to carry on, untrammelled by civilization. It is estimated that the aborigines number some 20,000 and that there are about 800 half-castes among them. Thus left in their wild state, the original inhabitants of this land are to be 'untrammelled by civilization.' It is a sad fact that the 'civilization' with which these people have been brought into contact has, in very few cases, brought them nearer to God or even raised them to a higher moral scale. What an indictment for our civilization that primitive people have to be defended against it! Is the Christianity of our nation really so bankrupt that we have to despair of winning over to it the people whose inheritance we have appropriated? It would seem so. If the Australian people were really a community of Christians, it would surely be our policy to absorb the native population and raise it up to our standards of civilization. It is to be hoped that this native reserve will not be closed against missionaries. And certainly missionary effort among these peoples will have more hope of success if they are 'untrammelled' by our civilization."

MUELLER.

Evidence for the Flood.—It will be worth while to preserve the following remarks of Professor Woolley which appeared in the *London Times* and were copied by the *Australian Lutheran*. Professor Woolley had been engaged in archeological research work, making excavations in Ur of the Chaldees. What he and his associates found he has vividly described in these words: "As we burrowed more

deeply, the various strata sloped more and more sharply until they sloped at an angle of roughly forty-five degrees, when the last strata suddenly flattened out and various fragments of each stratum lay on the bottom of a smooth deposit of water-laid mud.

"Another part of the city revealed that houses had been built on ground which had gradually risen until a terraced town stood high above the plain. We thus got a definite proof of what had hitherto been only assumed, namely, that the earliest settlement had been founded on an island in the marshy delta of the Euphrates and that rubbish heaps had been flung out from the walls, gradually increasing the size of the island. These heaps were subsequently used as cemeteries, though only after an immense lapse of time. We decided to sink deeper in the hope of finding evidence of a much earlier civilization, and eventually the workmen announced that they had reached virgin soil, consisting of clean water-laid clay, without the slightest admixture of pottery, ashes, or other human *débris*.

"In order to make sure, we dug deeper, through eight feet of solid, clean clay, and suddenly we unearthed a flat stratum richly littered with flints and pottery. Then again, still deeper, more pottery vessels and sherds of a type hitherto unknown and finally burned brick, also of a new type.

"This brick proves that Ur was not a mere village of mud huts when the vessels and flints were employed, but a town, civilized and properly built.

"Further excavations revealed a few feet above sea-level the true virgin soil, consisting of clean river silt of the island.

"What we have is this: a catastrophe buried the extremely early habitations, completely overwhelming the oldest settlement and causing an entire breach of civilization's continuity.

"It can only have been the Flood. Only a flood of unexampled magnitude could have deposited an eight-foot bank of clay upon Ur's original site."

A.

Hittite Words in the Bible. — Under this heading Dr. M. G. Kyle writes in the *Sunday-school Times*: "The Hittite discoveries never cease to furnish us with new information and new side-lights on Biblical subjects. Sometimes they are of the unexpected kind. Professor Sayce, the veteran of the world in the archeological field, recently contributed some most interesting Biblical data gleaned from the dry precincts of philology. . . . He points out a number of the Hittite words which have been taken over into the Hebrew, and some of which were even adopted into the Greek and so appear in the New Testament. It is most interesting to find both the Hebrew and the Greek words for 'wine' in the Bible to be but Semitized and Hellenized forms of the Hittite word *uinos*, which is indeed almost exactly our word 'wine.' The Hebrew word for priest, so very familiar to us in the common Jewish name Cohen, is also the Hittite word *kuanis*. Araunah, the Jebuzite, with whom David dealt so courteously in acquiring the site for the Temple, had the Hittite name, or title, perhaps, *Araunis*, meaning a 'freeman,' or 'noble,' which casts a flood of light on the importance of this man in his dealings with the king.

"Most interesting of all these sparks of illumination flying from the philological anvil is the story of the purchase of the cave of Machpelah. 'Ephron the Hittite' becomes most revealing. He is called 'the son of Zohar,' who 'dwelt among the children of Heth' (Gen. 23, 8. 10). But Zohar, a Hittite word, is simply 'agent.' 'A son of Zohar' represents Ephron as 'agent' of the merchants or, as we should say, 'real estate agent,' dwelling among the Hittites, that is, in the Hittite quarter of Hebron. With him was Abraham bargaining, with all the Oriental formality, in the purchase of a burial-place for his dead."

MUELLER.

The Old Testament Not a Species of a Genus, but Sui Generis.

According to a report in the *Christliche Apologete*, Dr. Volz, of the University of Tuebingen, discussing recently the latest excavations in the Orient and their bearing on the Bible, stated that the results show the religion of the Bible not to be a sister of the other ancient Oriental religions, perhaps the best one of them, but something entirely different. To prove this thesis, five points were presented by the lecturer: 1) The other Oriental religions are not monotheistic; and a monotheistic note here or there quickly fades away. In them a maternal deity and demons play an important rôle; on the Babylonian Sabbath no work is done from fear of demons. 2) The divinities of Babylon and Egypt were simply representations of the forces of nature, and hence images were made of them. The emphasis of the Old Testament on obedience, mercy, and righteousness rather than on sacrifices is foreign to the other religions. 3) The idea of a divine being who is first and last and whose loving plans are being carried out in his government of the world is not known to the other religions, even though Sennacherib and Nebuchadnezzar waged war in the name of their gods. 4) The other Oriental religions have a vast hierarchy, constituting a state in the state and making religious life entirely dependent on their decisions. In Israel, according to Ex. 19, 6, all are priests; the code of morals, summarized in the Ten Commandments, is very simple. (It must not be overlooked, of course, that the children of God at this time were still under the schoolmaster, as St. Paul says. — A.) 5) In other Oriental religions there is no true fear of God, for superstition and magic have entered in, the latter regarded as a means whereby the deity can be compelled to do man's bidding. Sin is not recognized as the evil it really is, and therefore the need of a Savior is not proclaimed. Only in the Bible could a chapter like Is. 53 appear. — It is heartening to see a testimony of this sort coming from a competent scholar, overthrowing the blasphemous conclusions of radical critics concerning the interdependence of the religions of Israel and the other Oriental nations.

A.

The Colosseum. — Of the Colosseum in Rome, where many Christians died a martyr's death, Dr. C. E. Macartney, after a visit to the so-called Eternal City, has given this concise account: —

"This huge structure was commenced by the Emperor Vespasian and finished by his son Titus, conqueror of the Jews. It was built to satisfy the Roman lust for the spectacular and the exciting, for blood-

shed and for cruelty. Covering five acres of ground, the colossal bowl could accommodate 85,000 of the populace of Rome. It is built in the shape of an ellipsis, founded on eighty arches, and rose to the dizzy height of 160 feet. The outside consists of four rows of columns, representing successive orders of architecture, Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian, and was encrusted with marble and decorated with statues. Inside, tiers of stone benches rose one above the other. Sixty-four exits, or vomitories, in a short time admitted or poured forth the blood-loving throngs. To this day you can see the Roman numerals on fragments of the arches showing the number of the entrance corresponding to the ticket held by the patron. Huge canopies could be spread over the seats to protect from rain and sun. Gushing fountains cooled and refreshed the air, and aromatics diffused a pleasant odor to offset that of the wild beasts. The open space in the center was called the arena, the Latin word for the sand with which it was carefully overlaid. Under the lowest tier of the benches were the dens of the wild beasts, for which the whole earth had been ransacked, and side by side with them the gloomy caverns where the prisoners and martyrs spent their last hours before they were thrust into the blazing arena to fight with beasts." A.

A Blasphemous Book by Emil Ludwig. — "Emil Ludwig's *The Son of Man* is published simultaneously in eight languages, which would seem to show that there was some organization back of it; for the book itself merits no such compliments. Its author is a Jew, who imitates Renan without possessing Renan's genius. He would discredit our Lord with Renanesque 'erotic perfume.' He says of Him, for example: 'He is gay, enjoys table pleasures, does not flee wine. He is so attractive that his beautiful hair and melting voice,' — and so on in more shocking ways one does not care to quote. Dr. Laible has pointed out the writer's 'incredible ignorance,' as, for example, when he writes that Jesus had never been in Jerusalem before His death save as a boy of twelve. 'There is system in these things, the system of Antichrist,' continues Dr. Laible. 'Christ is to be made insignificant and worship of Him impossible.' Considering the Jewish origin of the book, this is a very probable explanation." Thus writes Ernest Gordon in the *Sunday-school Times*. That his language is not too severe will be confirmed by the reading of a few pages of this pernicious book. Perhaps one redeeming feature of it is that its ungodly character is so evident as to disgust the reader when he has looked into the book for a few minutes. A.

The Radio and the Church. — Under this heading Roger W. Babson contributes an article to the *Congregationalist* in which he attempts the following prophecies about the changes which the radio will cause in the Church and its work: 1. There will be a gradual elimination of weak preaching because little churches will install a radio receiving-set with an amplifier, and thus great preachers can be heard. 2. Vacation supplies will be more or less eliminated for the same reason. 3. Because broadcasting from great stations will become common, our churches will be open more often than the people may hear religious music, inspirational addresses, instruction, and

good cheer. 4. The Gospel-message flashing over the land will revolutionize home-mission activities and thus reduce appropriations to that cause. 5. The radio is destined to give great impetus to interdenominational work and the federating of churches.

Commenting on these points, the *Watchman-Examiner* writes: "We have generally great respect for the opinion of Mr. Babson, but we cannot say that we agree with him in any one of his conclusions about the radio. The time is far distant when radio addresses can take the place of the spoken word and piercing eyes of the minister of Jesus Christ on fire with zeal for God and humanity. Then the fellowship of assembled audiences means much to worshipers. The radio is great, but no faithful minister need fear that it will put him out of business."

Much of this may be true; but unless pastors will take the proper precautions and warn where warnings are in place, the prophecy of Mr. Babson under point five may at least be partly fulfilled. Men like Cadman, Fosdick, and others are doing all they can to break down the wall of Scriptural belief and to federate the churches of our country on the platform of Modernism. MUELLER.

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

The church-papers report the death of the Rev. John Nicholas Lenker, D. D., at his home in Minneapolis, Minn. He passed away on May 16. Dr. Lenker's name is well known in the Lutheran Church of America, not only because of his book *Lutherans in All Lands*, but likewise on account of his efforts to have Luther's works translated into the English language. Several volumes of Luther's works translated into English have appeared under the editorship of Dr. Lenker.

The *Lutherische Herald* reports that the planned merger of the Evangelical Synod, the Reformed Church, and the United Brethren is not meeting with unqualified approval in the bodies concerned. The proposed merger makes almost the most far-reaching concessions conceivable to the spirit of unionism. And there is still some Christian consciousness left among the members of the three bodies which stands aghast at such laxity with respect to doctrine.

Mormons are working like beavers to make converts, not only here in America, but in Europe as well. Recently they held a congress in Vienna. It is said that there are 600,000 Mormons in Europe.

The English government, which, in the Treaty of Versailles, was given the mandate for German East Africa, lately issued an order to the effect that the English language is to be the medium of instruction in all schools in this territory. Even British and American missionaries are opposing this course. They do not wish to go any farther than to see English made one of the branches of instruction. Their point of view is that the aim of European governments and mission organizations must not be to make the African natives lay aside their own language and customs, but rather to let them keep whatever in their heritage is not objectionable. The policy endorsed by these missionaries is undoubtedly the only correct one.

Protestant students of Lausanne, Switzerland, have condemned a practise which has come into vogue, namely, that at funerals politicians and representatives of secular societies enter the pulpit and deliver eulogies. It goes without saying that their protest has our endorsement.

Not long ago Dr. F. B. Meyer, a renowned British evangelist, died. The religious journals dwell on the fact that, while his life was dedicated to practical church-work, he was a theologian of splendid erudition, frequently translating his text directly from the Greek or Hebrew original when addressing his congregation.

Recently Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands was publicly reproved for distributing, on a Sunday, the prizes that had been won by the contestants in the Olympic games. On that Sunday she had stayed away from church, and a congregation in Amsterdam felt that she had given offense by the course she took.

The *Ev.-Luth. Gemeindeblatt* reports that St. Peter's in Rome is in need of repairs. It may be that the earthquakes which visited Italy in recent years are responsible for the cracks that have appeared. Would to God that the only repairs needed were of an architectural nature!

A clergyman writes concerning the new papal state that the affair strikes him as a theatrical venture. He adds very aptly that the Church is richest when it is poor and never so poor as when it is rich.

Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, who since 1898 has been pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church in New York, has announced that in August he will retire from this position. He will at that time have reached the age of seventy. He belongs to the Congregationalists, which is not saying much as to the nature of his theology.

In Poland a national Church is endeavoring to gain a permanent existence. This Church strives for independence from Rome. The Socialists are assisting it in its endeavors to be recognized by the government authorities. The government itself is hostile to the undertaking.

We pass on this little item on the average salaries of ministers in the United States. The American Educational Association has published these figures. In 1926 the average salary of a minister was \$1,744 per annum. Presbyterians pay their pastors an average of \$2,500 a year; Disciples of Christ, \$2,250; Congregationalists, \$2,000; United Lutherans, \$1,800; Methodists, \$1,500; Baptists, about \$1,200; Southern Baptists, however, only \$775. The congregations of the latter are chiefly found in rural districts.

In Switzerland the total separation of Church and State is being discussed at present. It is chiefly the Socialists and Communists who are pointing out the necessity of such a separation. God has various ways of attaining His objective.

On the question why the New Testament refers to the Holy Spirit by a neuter noun since the Holy Spirit is a person, the *Lutheran* says quite aptly: "The confusion is due to the fact that in English we distinguish persons from things by means of genders, while the Greeks did not classify nouns on the same basis. The use of the neuter adjective in agreement with *pneuma* (Spirit) would no more signify absence of personality than does a similar connection of *das*, the neuter form of *the*, with *Fraeulein* in German."

From the *Watchman-Examiner* we see that Gino Speranza wrote a book entitled *Race or Nation*, in which he points out that during the Valley Forge period, when suffering in the American army was at its height and utter poverty was to be witnessed on all sides, the Continental Congress resolved to import 20,000 Bibles from Holland or Scotland. This was a remarkable tribute to the power of the Holy Scriptures, even though from the point of view of separation of Church and State it was inconsistent.

"The English language is rapidly becoming the language of the peoples of the earth. A striking illustration of this is found in the use of English in a new treaty between China and Norway. It is agreed that 'in the event of there being a difference between the two, the sense as expressed in the English text shall be held to prevail.' A new treaty with Belgium is written in Chinese, French, and English; but in case of difference of interpretation the English text shall be held to be authoritative."

Watchman-Examiner.

The papers announce that Dr. John R. Sampey has been elected president of the Southern Theological Seminary at Louisville, Ky. Dr. Sampey will take the place of the late Dr. E. Y. Mullins, who became president in 1899. The special field of Dr. Sampey is Old Testament Interpretation.